

REMARKS

Introduction

The December 31, 2003 Office Action has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended and in view of the arguments made herein, is respectfully requested. Claims 1 through 11 are currently pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8 have been amended. Applicants maintain that this Amendment is supported by the application, as originally-filed, and respectfully requests that this Amendment be entered. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of Applicants' invention. The Examiner alleged that the term "core" in Claim 1 is indefinite because no limitations have been recited to define this element of the claimed invention. The Examiner further alleged that the term "flip chip technology" in Claim 8 is vague because it is not recited or clear what devices constitute this technology.

In response, in an attempt to advance the prosecution of the subject application but without conceding either the correctness of the Examiner's position or the need for amendment, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite "a core of magnetic ferrite". Applicants maintain that the limitation "of magnetic ferrite" is clear because one skilled in the art could readily determine the type of core employed in the claimed invention.

In response, in an attempt to advance the prosecution of the subject application but without conceding either the correctness of the Examiner's position or the need for amendment, Applicants have amended Claim 8 to recite "said integrated circuit is coupled to said electronics

support portion using flip-chip technology”. Applicants maintain that the phrase “said integrated circuit is coupled to said electronics support portion using flip-chip technology” is clear because one skilled in the art could readily determine that the integrated circuit is constructed in the form of a flip-chip method of assembly.

Accordingly Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 through 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson, et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,727,360, in view of Stafford, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,482,008. The Examiner acknowledged that Ferguson does not disclose a core comprising a coil receiving portion and an electronics support portion. The Examiner alleged, however, that Stafford discloses a core with a receiving coil portion and an electronics support portion for a smaller device. The Examiner then concluded that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the coil and core disclosed in Stafford with the tag disclosed in Ferguson.

Applicants maintain that the claimed invention is patentable over Ferguson in view of Stafford. As the Examiner acknowledged Ferguson does not disclose a core comprising a coil receiving portion and an electronics support portion. The disclosure of Stafford does not cure the deficiencies of the Ferguson disclosure. Neither Ferguson nor Stafford disclose the use of a unitary core which comprises a cylindrical portion for receiving an antenna coil at one end and a flattened portion for containing or housing an electrical connection between an integrated circuit and/or a capacitor and the antenna coil at the other end. Furthermore, neither Ferguson nor Stafford teach the metalization of the flattened portion of the core. At column 4, lines 40

through 41, Ferguson discloses a “core 10 that includes an elongated thin flat ribbon of low-coercivity amorphous magnetic material.” At column 7, lines 21 through 25, Stafford discloses a device comprising a “microchip code circuit 5 for the identification code and a thermistor microchip 32 for temperature monitoring, both mounted on a card 33, together with a coil 6 of copper wire wound on a ferrite rod 34.” In contrast, the claimed invention includes a unitary core comprising a cylindrical portion for receiving the antenna coil at one end and a flattened portion for permitting or housing the electrical connection between the integrated circuit and/or capacitor and the antenna coil at the other end. Additionally, the flattened portion of the claimed invention is formed with an integral pair of metalization layers or pads to which the antenna coil is connected.

The claimed invention is patentable over Ferguson in view of Stafford because the claimed invention provides metalization layers on the core itself and the metalization layers enable an integrated circuit or capacitor to be easily electrically connected to the metalization layers in any of a variety of methods recognized in the art. Furthermore, based on this unitary metalized core construction, the antenna of the claimed invention is directly connected to the ferrite core and does not require a printed circuit board or any other mounting part. Accordingly, this core construction provides support for the integrated circuit or capacitor and allows for a quicker and more cost efficient construction because the construction eliminates the need for a printed circuit board or other mounting part.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Double Patenting

Claims 1 through 11 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,400,338 (which is the parent to the instant application).

In the interests of expediting prosecution, and without conceding that these rejections have merit, Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to the parent application, U.S. Patent No. 6,400,338. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the claims in the present invention are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

Any additional fees or charges necessary in connection with the present application are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4709.

Respectfully submitted,

 43,531

Steven B. Pokotilow
Registration No. 26,405
Attorneys for Applicants
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP
180 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038
(212) 806-5400

